

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1860.

NO. 37.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

Terms: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, domestic, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law. Our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promise; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

For "The Principia."

WAY-MARKS IN THE MORAL WAR WITH SLAVERY.

BY REV. HENRY T. CHEEVER.

NO. XV.

To take note, in these papers, of all the Congregational Bodies that have affirmed the principle of non-fellowship with slaveholders, and of exclusion from the privileges of the Church, on account of the sin of slaveholding, were neither necessary nor possible. Reference has been had to the leading influence and example in New England, of the Rhode Island Consociation, and of the Report adopted by that Body in 1854, against fellowship with slavery, or correspondence with any ecclesiastical bodies that tolerated slavery among its members and churches.

Five years later, the General Association of New York, at its yearly session in 1859, declared with great unanimity, "That the holding of human beings as property is an immorality, the renunciation of which ought to be made a condition of membership in the Christian Church;" thereby adopting the principle of non-fellowship with slaveholders, and affirming the alleged "almost universally repudiated principle of Church discipline," viz: that slaveholding should be treated as a disciplinable offence.

The Congregational Conference of Minnesota, at its fourth annual meeting at Winona, in October of the same year, resolved, "That the holding of human beings as property, is an immorality, against which all Christians are to bear testimony, by withholding Christian fellowship from all who are guilty of it."

Of single churches, the following are some that have recorded their testimony against the "crime of crimes," and have adopted the principle of refusing fellowship with slaveholders in positive terms.

The CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH OF LISBON, CT., in 1843, passed the following resolution as its rule.

"Resolved, That we feel constrained, in a spirit of meekness, to reprove and rebuke all professing Christians, ministers, and churches, who tolerate slavery in word or deed, and that we cannot extend the fellowship of the Gospel to those who continue to enslave their fellow men after the faithful admonition of their christian brethren."

And, once at least, since that time, they have had occasion to apply the rule, in debarring from the pulpit, and from the communion-table, a slaveholding minister, a friend of the acting pastor.

The Salem street Congregational Church, of Worcester Mass., (Morrill Richardson, pastor), in June, 1859, adopted the following:

Whereas, American slavery is the "sum of all villainies" therefore,

Resolved, As a church of Christ, that we renounce all church association, connection, and fellowship with slave-

holders and slave-traders, and with all who, in any manner knowingly and persistently, uphold or countenance slavery.

Resolved, That so long as our blessed Redeemer, in the person of the slave, is forced to perform unpaid labor upon Southern plantations, is sold to the highest bidder, upon the auction block, is scourged for righteousness' sake, is pursued with chains, pistols and bloodhounds, in escaping to a free country; so long it is the christian duty of his professed followers, to raise their voice, and wield all their influence to destroy the abomination; and the individual or the church that intentionally fails to do this, must be treated by us as unworthy of the christian name.

The Union Congregational church of the same city, (Ebenezer Cutler, pastor), in 1860, adopted the same principles in similar terms.

The Central Congregational Church of Bangor, Maine, (Professors George Shepherd, and Samuel Harris, of the Bangor Theological Seminary, co-pastors), in the month of February, 1860, expressed its sentiments on the subject of slavery, and fellowship with slaveholders, as follows:

Resolved, That the holding of human beings in bondage as slaves, and treating them as property, is contrary to the law of God, and the spirit of christianity.

Resolved, That every person sustaining the legal relation of a master to a slave, who claims that a slave is rightfully his property, and uses him as an article of property for his own gain, freely giving his support and consent to the system of American slavery as good and right, is guilty of conduct incompatible with the religion of Christ, and is not entitled to christian fellowship, nor to recognition as a christian minister.

Resolved, That every person claiming to be a Christian minister, and not sustaining the legal relation aforesaid, who preaches that human beings may rightfully be held as property, and that the system of American slavery is justified by the Bible, and ought to be perpetuated and extended as a beneficial system, is not entitled to recognition as a christian minister.

Resolved, That every person claiming to belong to the Christian Church, who intentionally gives his influence to sustain the system of American Slavery, furnishes mournful evidence of possessing a spirit not in accordance with the mind of Christ.

The Congregational Church of Millbury, Ill., at its monthly meeting in April, 1860, resolved unanimously to become auxiliary to the Church Anti-Slavery Society of the United States, and to make it a subject of prayer at our monthly meetings, and to take a quarterly collection in aid of the cause it advocates.

The Elgin Congregational Association in the same State, took action as follows, the same month.

Whereas, American slavery, in asserting its arrogant claim to chattelize human beings, has fully justified Mr. Wesley's definition of it, as "the sum of all villainies," and

Whereas, God has constituted the church, for the purpose of maintaining the right, and rebuking sin, whether perpetrated in the dens of pollution, or the halls of Legislation, therefore,

Resolved, That we are loudly called to action, to energetic and effective efforts for the entire abolition of this monstrous iniquity.

Resolved, That we cordially approve the course of action recommended by the "CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES," organized in Worcester, Mass., and, in the "Irrepressible Conflict," now waged between Liberty and Slavery, we pledge them our cheerful and hearty co-operation.

Resolved, That we recommend to the churches in our connection, the early organization of auxiliaries on the plan proposed by that Society.

Resolved, That we would most effectually recommend to our brethren, "To remember those that are in bonds as bound with them" and to exert their influence, in every appropriate manner, to "Deliver the spoiled out of the hands of the oppressor."

Without protracting this investigation any further, we have only now, to say, how immense the moral power that would be exerted against slavery, if a majority of only the Congregational Churches of this country,—moulded after the free New Testament form, and reflecting, perhaps, most truly of any denomination, the views of the men who com-

pose it,—would record their testimony upon the great questions of the age, in honest terms, like these:

Whereas, It is the solemn duty of those who claim to be the followers of Christ, and who are banded together as a Christian Church, to make an uncompromising application of the principles of the Gospel to all sin, and especially to enforce a rigid christian discipline against the unchristian practice of slaveholding.

Therefore, Resolved, that no slaveholders shall be allowed to be a member of this church, or shall be invited to its pulpit or its communion, and that this church, unwilling to be partakers in other men's sins, hereby refuses fellowship with any church or religious body that defends or tolerates slavery, or refuses to bring its discipline to bear against so heinous a sin as slaveholding.

For The Principia.

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NUMBER VII.

The right to establish justice includes the right to abolish slavery. But we wish to present the right of National Abolition in some of its varied aspects.

First. It is the right of humanity in behalf of humanity. It is the right to fly to the relief of distress. It is the right to deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor. To the exercise of this right, in a revolutionary way, we largely owe our National Independence. Our fathers in their terrible struggle never thought of the State rights of Great Britain as an objection to receiving the aid of foreigners. Surely it is with an ill grace that we decline the deliverance of our own countrymen through our own Government, on the ground of State rights.

Secondly. The right of national Abolition is the right to pay, an honest debt. We have heaped wrongs upon the slave, and owe him all the reparation possible. Not to go back to the kidnapping of his ancestors, it was an outrage against him to establish a Government and exclude him from its privileges, while his plunderer was freely admitted to all its benefits and honors. This brought power and security to oppression and despair to its victim. Talk of non-interference! Here was interference with a vengeance! Either secure to the slave his equal rights, or let him alone. Protect him, or leave him the chance of escape. He has been cruelly shut out of the pale of humanity. Efforts for human amelioration are not for him. He may not plead his own cause, nor may others plead it for him. Care has been taken that his master's conscience should not be disturbed by faithful rebukes. In short, no stone has been left unturned to make his lot friendless and hopeless. Surely we owe him something, and as we can pay him nothing, without first emancipating him, we are bound to do that.

Thirdly. We have a right of National Abolition on the ground of the slaveholder's own demand of national interference. It may seem strange that his clamor for State rights and non-interference is coupled with a demand for the nation's interference in support of slavery. But so it is. And surely if the slaveholder requires the nation's interference, we may come at his demand, and when we are on the ground, we may inquire which party has right on his side, the slave or his master, and act accordingly.

Fourthly. We have a right of National Abolition on the ground of international duty. We owe the abolition of slavery to foreign nations. So long as we tolerate slavery, it will rule us, and wield the nation's power. And while slavery wields the power of a great nation, no weak nation within its reach can be secure. Slavery breeds a multitude of idle hands. Idle hands must have mischief to do, and what mischief more congenial to such hands than filibustering? Slavery, being an interest in conflict with all the interests of humanity, has causes of war peculiarly its own,

and peculiar materials for a lawless soldiery, by which wars will be attended with peculiar atrocities. In short, slavery is like a worthless dog, which is always ready to commit depredations on the neighboring sheep. We have no right to keep such a dog.

Fifthly. The right of Abolition is a right of national defense. Always, in peace or war, slavery is the nation's enemy. And no enemy in war is more hostile to the nation's interest. Every day it does more wrong against us than would be regarded as just cause of war against any other nation. When President Polk labored to show that Mexicans outrages against American citizens were "unparalleled," he might have sustained his charge with more truth and less pains against slavery. How might he have moved our indignation, could he have told us that millions of our countrymen were compelled to toil in rags and poverty for Mexican lords, without compensation; or could he have described the sorrows of a Mexican slave auction, of which Americans were the victims; or portrayed a gang of Americans, chained together and driven through Mexican States, under Mexican whips. Such are familiar scenes in many parts of the nation. And surely they can exist in no nation under heaven, without a national right to put an end to them.

Sixthly. Our right of National Abolition rests on *economic* grounds. The cost of slavery to the nation is prodigious. The system does not support itself, but draws upon the resources of freedom, in various ways. This necessarily results from its robbing labor of its reward and branding it with disgrace. Bankruptcies and commercial revulsions are in the train of evils which slavery brings. It is a worse pecuniary burden to the nation than town paupers are to a town. This subject is not sufficiently understood, but we cannot enlarge. The reader who is not duly informed may obtain startling information by reading a work entitled *Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, by William Goodell.

Seventhly. We derive a warrant for National Abolition from the *perfidy* of the slave power. What is more faithless? Its violations of the Federal Compact are habitual. Slavery is one form of injustice, bad faith is another. Both result from the same disregard of right. The fruit of one tree, they are naturally found together.

Eighthly. Over and above our natural right of establishing justice, we have a right of *national compact*. We have entered into a national covenant for the security of justice and liberty. The terms of the covenant are unequivocal. "But slaveholders did not intend to have it take effect exactly as it reads." So much the more, then, does justice, the end of the compact, require its execution, to the letter. A court of justice will not release you from the terms of a bond, on the ground that you did not intend to fulfill it, but had certain mental reservations which you chose not to have appear in the instrument. Least of all will it do this, when the bond only requires the discharge of those natural obligations which every Government has a right to enforce.

Finally. Either National Abolition or national ruin is unavoidable. With slavery cherished in our political system, all attempts to avert the doom of a kingdom divided against itself, will only illustrate political folly. Seeming prosperity for a time will make final ruin the more terrible.

I. S.

CHURCH OF THE PURITANS TO DR. CHEEVER.—DR. CHEEVER ON THE INDEPENDENT.

The attack on Dr. Cheever by *The Independent* of 12th inst., just before his embarking for England, was the more cowardly as, in the bustle of preparation for the voyage, it gave him no proper opportunity to reply. Providentially, however, it came just in season for a brief extempore notice of it, the very evening of the day (Thursday) of its appearance, in a Speech of Dr. Cheever, at a meeting of his friends, at the house of Dr. Fairbank. On that occasion, EDWARD GILBERT Esq., the Chairman, read an Address from the CHURCH OF THE PURITANS to their Pastor, as follows.

ADDRESS TO DR. CHEEVER.

REV. GEORGE B. CHEEVER.—*Dear Sir:* In the last two of your Sabbath evening discourses you admonished us of the duties of ministers and Churches in the present crisis, and of some of your purposes in going abroad. You also recalled the history of the conflict in our own Church, and for our encouragement declared your firm belief that God would sustain us through the struggle, and give us the victory.

You also gave us words of parting advice and warning, and closed with the adoption and application of the confidence of Paul toward the Philippians, "trusting in God that our rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for you, by your coming to us again." "Only let your conversation be as it becometh the Gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit with one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel, and in nothing terrified by your adversaries: which is to them an evident token of perdition; but to you of salvation and that of God. For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for his sake."

In view of this, we, as your Church, feel that a word from us, in response, may not be inappropriate, for, having stood by you, and, according to our best endeavors, sustained you in this memorable conflict, which has been as much a struggle for existence as an agonizing resistance against sin, we cannot be indifferent to the associations of this time, nor to the step you propose.

Although our memoranda show that, taking the past year as an index, not less than eleven-twelfths of your pulpit discourses have been upon the common spiritual topics, dealing with doctrine, reproof, exhortation, &c., and attended with the corresponding results of edification, conversions, and accessions to the church, yet we must declare that your attention to the "vexed question," as it has created this occasion, supplies the main hints of what we have to say here. To us, as to yourself, the word of God, and all its precious, fundamental doctrines of the Atonement, the Divine Regenerating Spirit, Faith in a Divine Redeemer, Repentance toward God, the whole blessed circle of truth as the truth is in Jesus, are dear above all things, constituting the only ground of our hope for eternity, and the only possibility and means of our life and usefulness as a Church and as individuals. In that word, in those truths, in the law and the Gospel, in the Old and New Testaments, and especially in the light of the cross, in the dying love of Christ, we find at once the obligation and the means of laboring for the freedom and salvation of the enslaved and their children. We have been taught to feel that a great and solemn responsibility rest upon the Churches and Ministry of our country in this particular work. It is our commission from Him, the sign and result of whose coming and kingdom are this, that He shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor. We rejoice with you to acknowledge that, in the presence and under the prevalence of the iniquity of slavery, the earnest, continued, and persistent denunciation of this is the especial duty of the Churches of Christ in America; and we, as a Church, have accepted and do accept this part of our Christian warfare, and are glad again to declare our purpose and business in reference to the sin of slavery to be nothing less than its entire abolition, the freedom of those now held in bondage, and just where they are thus held, and the giving of them there, according to God's command, that which is just and equal. We are not permitted to have any lower end than this, or to labor with any other object in view than the deliverance of the oppressed. Our power and sole dependence in this purpose and work is the word and spirit of God. We have contended for the plainest and most obvious interpretation of that word; and with what we cannot but call a conscientious adherence to the word thus interpreted, we have pronounced slaveholding, as practised in our country, upheld by our laws and courts, and sanctioned by our Churches, to be the sin of man-stealing, a crime equal to murder, which should be reprobated as an immorality by our Churches, and punished as a felony by our laws.

For the faithful proclamation of these principles you and we have been denounced as ultraists, fanatics, and madmen. For this a raid has been instituted to overthrow your pulpit, and a plan laid by those who stood in Church covenant relations with you and us, and who in former years solemnly dedicated our church edifice to the service of the living God, to take possession of that edifice and appropriate it to a more popular use. For this faithfulness to God's Word you were, on the evening of the great Union meeting held in December last at the Academy of Music, publicly burned in effigy on Union square, by a misguided mob, impelled by merchants of respectability and standing in this city. And for this you have been made the object of incessant abuse on the part, not only of the secular, but the religious newspapers of the country.

Thus it has not been our election or declaration, but the providential discipline of God, and the pressure and manifestation of his truth, in which we have endeavored to commend ourselves as a Church and pastor to the consciences of all men in the sight of God, in this thing, that has occasioned you to be marked and assailed as a leader in the cause of Christian Abolitionism. The opponents of that cause themselves demonstrate their own judgment of your position and influence by the violence of their reproaches and by making you the object of their bitterest denunciations; at the same time accusing you of assuming for yourself a monopoly of effort and zeal, and for your Church, and its struggles in sustaining you, an importance to the cause and a merit in its prosecution, of which they affirm we are entirely unworthy. *The New York Observer*, in a leading article on the speeches in your behalf by Drs. Candlish, Guthrie, Buchanan and others in Great Britain, undertakes to assure those gentlemen that the people here have no confidence in you as an Abolitionist, and that they themselves

will discover, to their own confusion, that you are no true friend to the slave. The editors of that paper have interwoven in this article two distinct and absolute falsehoods in regard to this Church and yourself, as having fellowship with slaveholders and excluding the colored race among us from the privileges of religious worship in the house of God.

The New York Independent of this very week, in an article full of misstatement and perversion in reference to your proposed mission, repeats this slander of your fellowship, and utters the barefaced falsehood that the resolution "that the holding of human beings as property is an immorality, the renunciation of which ought to be made a condition of membership in the Christian Church, and that this sin is one against which the law of God and the gospel of Christ ought to be proclaimed, in preaching persistently, until the iniquity be overthrown," passed by the General Congregational Association of New York, in September last, was presented by the pastor of the Tabernacle Church. The well known fact that this resolution, with a slight verbal alteration to suit the conservative proclivities of the Committee on Resolutions, was your own, and that it was, at the time you offered it, opposed by the pastor of the Tabernacle Church, fills us with grave surprise at the mendacious audacity of those with whom we are contending. Dr. Thompson is editor of *The Independent*, and knows these facts. The main statements of this article are utterly and entirely false.

These slanders and injurious attacks are a very natural consequence of that course of effort and events which, in God's providence, has caused you to be regarded and criticized as a leader. For ourselves, it is inevitable that we should thus regard you. Our enemies now leave us no alternative. There are good reasons likewise why you have come to be so esteemed, without any purpose or effort of yours or ours, in that you have appeared so prominently and persistently (when others would not stand forward) in advocacy of this sacred cause, to the manifest disparagement of our reputation, as that is estimated among men, and to the injury of your works both here and in Great Britain; also, in your well-known position as established in one of the foremost of our metropolitan Churches, in the heart of the metropolis of America; also, in your equally well known exertions in the controversy for temperance; for the integrity of the doctrine of the Trinity; for the Bible in schools; for the just, retributive sanctions of Government, and against the iniquity of Popery. In view of these reasons, it would not be assumption for us to call you a leader. But our principal reason is apart from all these. It is found in the fact that, throughout the rank and file of the American clergy, except yourself (we except here some honored names in a more limited sphere), we have in vain looked for any who, having the facilities of wide influence and prominence before the public, were willing to proclaim and insist upon, as the basis of anti-slavery effort, the Bible doctrine of the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding. Some of them concede that the moral duties, which, as they allege, grow out of the existence of slavery, should be preached upon. Others, more advanced, proclaim themselves ready to condemn the evils, as they term them, incident to slavery, while they are careful to assert that they are not *Abolitionists*, and do not propose to interfere with the vested rights of the States.

Now, sir, we have been compelled to regard this as a compromise of principle and a connivance with the sin. If slavery is to be dealt with, at all, it is because it is opposed to the Word of God, and we are to attack it where it exists. We rejoice in your constructions of the Biblical argument as more explicitly set forth in your last work on the Crime and Guilt of Slaveholding. We feel that the argument, as there stated, is from the logic of inspiration; that we cannot gainsay or resist it without palpably disavowing and repudiating the Word of God; that, from its very, binding radicalism and terrible certainty, it affords the best, surest and only true foundation for any moral effort or movement in behalf of the enslaved. We are happy, also, in refutation of the slanders so diligently circulated, that your anti-slavery ministrations have been without effect, and but a waste of time and effort, to declare publicly that though, aside from the convictions we have just expressed, many of us might, from sentiment or philanthropy, oppose slavery, yet that the burden of responsibility for the deliverance of the slave, the sense of personal duty in this respect, the yearning and constraint of conscience, and of the love of Christ in behalf of the oppressed which we feel, are in great part the fruit of your teaching.

Now, sir, in turn, we exhort you to hold fast these doctrines and proclaim them boldly. While speaking abroad of national sins, we trust that neither sorrow, nor shame, nor any imagined duty of loyalty to our institutions will justify the fidelity of your statements or diminish the ardor of your rebuke. Having Christ's commission, may you be careful only to honor Him and promote His cause in this blessed work.

In parting, accept our best wishes and most fervent prayers. While on the ocean or in other lands, you may feel that you are remembered in our prayer circle, at our family altars and in our closets.

You will please communicate our grateful remembrances and hearty thanks to our sympathizing friends in Great Britain, especially to those who have, on public occasions and in so signal a manner, manifested their appreciation of our cause and labors.

May God
investigate
truth and

DEAR I appreciate
sitting exp
of Christ,
yet term
troubles
all nearer
of laboring
and precis
ing. In th
the name
have grace
even such
friends, the
unto us it
lieve on his
expected th
quest by th
slavery in
and persev
encounter c
not anticip
Britain, suc
and injurio
cle in this
fault in thi
tained and
and practis
truth and i
ances again
compound c
evil intent
sent is not
our affairs,
advice to th
country a co
sympathy o
perverted an
term it, to th
"Church me
proached us
Church, gett
improper ma
may you hav
you to deal
in this attac
think it will
deed, by the
of our caus
against this
in the words
"It is a we
slaveholder
er's Church,
case was kno
(1860) dismis
This is a no
shall now sin
of mine which
to "a tissue
having been
my knowledge
against slave
in the same
charge is an
single circum
but originally
ing joined my
the year 1856
bation of the
fence of free
lady was not
holder, and I
a slave girl g
tendant in her
her home, tha
the homestead
The same sl
Observer, and
lished by the
a slaveholder,
elate that this
Puritans, with
being aware o
of her leaving
being acquaint
appears in pub
known anythin
nor ever came
cerning what
until about the
of the husband
file slaveholdin
Observer parad
Lees, since tha
Church of the
our Church in

May God bless you, and in due time give you back to us invigorated and restored, to lead us on to new conquests for truth and righteousness.

DR. CHEEVER'S REPLY.

DEAR BRETHREN AND CHRISTIAN FRIENDS:—My heart appreciates your kindness, and I wish I could give you a fitting expression of my gratitude and love. In the cause of Christ, in a great and bitter conflict, protracted, and not yet terminated, you have been firm and faithful. These troubles bring us nearer to each other; may they bring us all nearer to God. We have reason to regard the privilege of laboring for the deliverance of the enslaved as too great and precious to be enjoyed without some degree of suffering. In this sacred cause, if we have to bear reproaches for the name of Christ, happy are we. I pray God that we have grace not only to meet manfully and endure patiently even such assaults as are made against us from professed friends, though real slanderers, but to be truly grateful that unto us it is given, in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake. It cannot be expected that so great and mighty an advancement and conquest by the Kingdom of Christ as that of the abolition of slavery in our own land can be accomplished without great and persevering labor, the endurance of hardship, and the encounter of enmity and wrath. But I confess that I did not anticipate, just on the eve of my departure for Great Britain, such a singular ebullition of ill feeling, and false and injurious remark, as have been referred to, in the article in this week's *Independent*, against a Church whose only fault in this thing has been that they have resolutely sustained and warmly loved their pastor, and have sanctioned, and practised, and maintained the utmost freedom of the truth and independence of the pulpit in his continued utterances against the sin of slaveholding. I am amazed at the compound of bitterness and falsehood in that article. Its evil intent cannot but recoil upon its author. But the present is not the time for exposing its misrepresentations of our affairs, or the insolence and insinuated slanders of its advice to the people of Great Britain to send over to this country a commission of merchants to see that the gifts and sympathy of the Churches there toward this Church be not perverted and misapplied. It is an innuendo, as the lawyers term it, to the effect that we are not only a Church guilty of "Church mendacity," as that paper has sneeringly reproached us, but that we are a dishonest and swindling Church, getting money on false pretences, to spend it in an improper manner. Dear brethren and Christian friends, may you have that wisdom which is from above, to enable you to deal with this slander, and with the other falsehoods in this attack, in a righteous and Christian way. I do not think it will much injure me or you in Great Britain; indeed, by the blessing of God, it may turn to the furtherance of our cause. Besides the attack in *The Independent* against this Church, there is also the fabrication introduced in the words following:

"It is a well-attested fact that, for nearly ten years, a slaveholder was a member in full communion in Dr. Cheever's Church, and, instead of being disciplined, though the case was known to the officers of the Church, was recently (1860) dismissed by letter as in good standing."

This is a new concoction of old lies, in regard to which I shall now simply present the following extract from a letter of mine which has been published in Edinburgh, referring to "a tissue of absolute falsehoods concerning a slaveholder having been admitted to my Church, and kept in it with my knowledge and consent, and all the while preaching against slaveholding as a crime against God and man, set in the same catalogue with the crime of murder. The whole charge is an entire and perfect falsehood, grounded on the single circumstance of a lady from the Methodist Church, but originally from a slaveholding family in Kentucky, having joined my Church in this city, and then quitted us in the year 1856, about the time when my discourse in reprobation of the outrage against Senator Sumner, and in defence of free speech against slavery was delivered. This lady was not known by us to have been herself a slaveholder, and I believe never was such, except by having had a slave girl given her by her parents for her maid and attendant in her childhood. When this lady married, and left her home, that slave woman was retained by her parents at the homestead in Kentucky."

The same slander is renewed this week in *The New York Observer*, and the certificate of a gentleman has been published by the editor of that paper, stating that his wife was a slaveholder, and that Dr. Cheever knew it. I hereby declare that this lady was received into the Church of the Puritans, without any person in the church, that I know of, being aware of her being a slaveholder, and up to the time of her leaving in 1856, I am not aware of any in the Church being acquainted with that fact, of which her husband now appears in public to bear witness; neither have I myself known anything but the above-mentioned circumstances, nor ever came even to so much knowledge as this, concerning what her husband now testifies as to her condition, until about the time of her leaving the Church. The name of the husband of the lady, whose certificate as to the bona fide slaveholding qualifications of his wife *The New York Observer* parades in its editorial columns, I suppose to be Lees, since that is the lady whose connection with the Church of the Puritans I have noted above. This lady left our Church in 1856. The editor of *The Independent* de-

clares that it is a well-attested fact that a slaveholder (meaning, doubtless, this lady) was for nearly ten years in communion with the Church, the officers of the Church knowing her as a slaveholder, and was dismissed in 1860. What witnesses *The Independent* may have summoned I cannot tell, nor what records its editors may have consulted for their well-attested facts, unless it be the columns of *The Observer*. Neither can I tell what possible advantage either the one paper or the other expects to gain, either against the Church of the Puritans or its pastor, even supposing that there had been such a thing tolerated in that Church as the membership of a slaveholder previous to the year 1856, if at that time the application of divine truth became too pungent to be endured, and if since then the Church and the pastor have practised that truth more faithfully, maintaining that slaveholding under all circumstances is sinful, and ought not to be permitted in any Christian Church, nor any fellowship tolerated with slaveholders. Dear Christian friends and brethren—May God still sustain and guide us in this conflict. May God be with you and bless you. May His grace keep you all firm and faithful to the end. May He spare us still to labor together for Him. May He keep us in our journeyings, and restore us from our wanderings and separations, to accomplish, by his blessing, yet more in his delightful service than we have even yet undertaken, and with more loving and entirely consecrated hearts and lives.

"HOW TO STOP AGITATION."

Under this head, the *N. Y. Times* of July 17th, discourses as follows:

"As we stated, the other day, we cannot regard the Douglas ticket as fairly representing the principle of Popular Sovereignty. Mr. Douglas abandoned the leading feature of that policy in his conspiracy speech, when he invoked the power of the Federal Government to guarantee slave property to its owners within the States. His colleague on the ticket, moreover, Mr. H. V. Johnson, of Georgia, is among the most open and resolute of the opponents of the whole doctrine of Popular Sovereignty—and advocates Congressional protection for Slavery in the Territories. We think it not improbable that, if this ticket were elected, the whole Slavery question would be treated and settled on this basis—that the people of each locality would, in the end, be left to manage this matter for themselves. But we have very little doubt that the same result would follow the election of any other ticket,—simply because it will be found impossible to carry through Congress any measure founded upon any other principle.

But suppose Douglas should be elected President,—how is that to stop the Slavery agitation? Could he silence the demands of either Northern or Southern ultraists? He might veto their acts,—but he could not silence their voices. He might arrest legislation, but he could not control public discussion in the Press and on the stump. He might disarm faction, but he could not suppress its clamors. All the parties which live and thrive by agitation, would have redoubled motives for continuing it—it would be their only hope of achieving power. Every act of his Administration would be watched and judged, by its bearing on this question. The Republicans would find their account in assailing every movement he might make upon the subject, and the Abolitionists, as Mr. Wendell Phillips avowed at Brooklyn, would make every valley and hill-top ring with the wildest Anti-Slavery agitation which has ever disturbed the country. The Southern ultraists, on the other hand, would have precisely the same reasons for pursuing a similar course, and would wage a systematic warfare on his administration, in its relations to Slavery.

It may be said that he would sustain his administration against them all,—that the principle of Popular Sovereignty would be triumphantly sustained both in Congress and by the people. Very likely,—but this would not be suppressing agitation. However it might end, the war would still go on, and the contest rage with greater fury than ever.

In our deliberate judgment, nothing will contribute more to the silence of clamorous controversy on the subject of Slavery, than the triumph of the Republican Party. That party would then be compelled to assume the responsibility of dealing practically with this whole subject. All parties would, from necessity await its action. Both Northern and Southern ultraists would find their only material for agitation in what it might do. No one need be told that a Republican Administration could not satisfy either. It could not interfere with Slavery in any Southern State, nor is there any reason to believe that it would give any section of the country ground of valid complaint. Its first necessity would be to divert public attention from this subject; to bring forward, into their just prominence, the great questions of domestic and foreign concern which have been so long neglected. Every dictate of self-interest would require it to let Slavery alone,—to allay public excitement in regard to it,—to relieve the apprehensions of the South and restore a feeling of confidence and repose to the whole community. And it is the only Party which has sufficient influence with the Anti-Slavery element to coerce it into acquiescence, and to check the agitation which has marked its progress, hitherto."

Thus reasons *The Times*. The leading object of many shrewd supporters of the Republican party, is the overthrow

of "abolitionism proper." This, it will be recollected, was the open avowal of the late Rev. Dr. Taylor of New Haven, who joined the Republicans, in 1856.

We have no doubt that these shrewd men reason correctly. And yet there are many who will vote the Republican ticket with the profession of precisely the opposite intentions. If they are sincere, and continue to be so, it is certain that the success of the Republican party will sadly disappoint one or the other wing of its supporters. What shall keep the party together, then, unless, as *The Times* anticipates, the "Anti-Slavery element" shall be coerced to acquiescence, and unless the Tariff question can be made to "divert attention from abolition."

Letter from Charles Stuart of Canada.

TO WILLIAM GOODELL:

My dear friend:—While still the storm of tyranny howls over your country, warring against God, and trampling upon the most sacred rights of human nature, my soul is refreshed by such statements, as appear in the 32nd No. of your *Principia*; where I find that the Wesleyan Connection; The United Brethren in Christ; The Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, Old School; The United Presbyterian Church; The Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of the U. S.; and the Free Will Baptist Church, reject all fellowship with that "sum of all villainies," the slave system of the United States. And when contemplating the political course of Horace Greeley, the compromising principles of such otherwise noble men as H. W. Beecher, and C. M. Clay; and the idolatries of fallen reason, as urged by the loving and lovely Gerrit Smith, I am animated with new delight at the impregnable strength of "*Principia*," and thank God for their unflinching advocacy through you. The noble course of the Cheevers: the Church A. S. Society, lately formed, or forming: the late rejection in Boston, of the great lie of the slave party, that the Constitution of your country sanctions slaveholding thereby more powerfully impeding the A. S. cause, than anything which its direct enemies could do; and the existence among you, of such men, as Hyatt, Fee, the Tappans, and Jocelyn, &c., &c., sustain the best hopes of the real friends of your country, for your emancipation of all colors, from the loathsome behests of slavery, which in a measure, are now trampling you all.

To me, as dear as are the liberties of my own country would be the restoration to freedom, of the U. States.

LORA, July 7th, 1860.

C. STUART.

FILLIBUSTERS FOR MEXICO.—K. G. C. GEORGE BICKLEY has issued a bombastic fulmination to the "Knights of the Golden Circle" in the Southern States, calling on them to pour in men and money for the conquest of Mexico. He summons them all to meet at Fort Ewen, on the south bank of the Nueces River, on or before the 15th of September. His appeal is based mainly on the necessity of Southernizing as well as Americanizing, Mexico, for the sake of strengthening Slavery.

Signor Mata gives a flat contradiction to the assertion of these men that they have the countenance and support of leading Mexicans and of the Constitutional Government. He authorizes the statement that President Juarez neither desires, nor will he accept the aid of any such adventurers. Nor does Gen. Comonfort give them the slightest favor. All Mexicans here regard the movement as one of lawless robbery and spoliation, and desire the prompt interference of the Government for its suppression.—*Times*.

For the Principia.

NOMINATING CONVENTION.

There will be a Convention of Radical Abolitionists held at Syracuse, N. Y. on the 3d. Wednesday of August, being the 15th day thereof, at 10 o'clock, A. M., to nominate candidates for President and Vice President of the United States; also to nominate candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor of this State.

The men and women of this, and other States, who occupy radical positions in Anti-Slavery and Temperance, are earnestly invited to attend and take part in this convention.

W. W. CHAPMAN,
J. C. HARRINGTON,
OTIS SIMMONS.

Central
Committee.

MINETTO, N. Y. July 5th 1860.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1860.

THE BRITISH AID MISSION.

Having noticed, last week, the virulent attack of *The Independent*, on the "Church of the Puritans" and in opposition to the "British Aid Mission" of its pastor, Dr. CHEEVER, we now proceed to notice more particularly, some of the points of the attack. As *The Independent* professes to "have no means of information upon the affairs of the Church of the Puritans, which are not accessible to the public"—we may venture, in common with the rest of "the public," to form and express our own opinions upon the matters presented by that journal. Its first argument is thus stated:

1. That there would be no difficulty in supporting the ministry in that church, if the church members were united in each other, and in their pastor. In proof of this, we refer to the fact, that so recently as May, 1859, the Society of the Church of the Puritans, was officially declared free from debt—a generous subscription to cancel arrearages having been made in the society at large. Yet at that very time, a few members of the church had secretly sent to England for aid, with the representation that the church could not support itself. Now, some of the largest donors to that subscription of 1859, are treated as enemies of the church, because they will not sanction what they regard as an unnecessary and humiliating appeal for foreign aid. The Church of the Puritans, if united, is to-day as well able to support itself as is any church in the City of New York. The occasion of the division in the church and society, just now, so far as we can understand it, appears to be this very project of foreign begging, which has become a party measure, involving much personal controversy. Our brethren in England and Scotland, can form their own judgement from the documents. But before investing money in the enterprise, they should take care that they really understand the facts. This they cannot do, without sending a commission over here, to examine into the case.

Of course we know, and so did the British as well as the American public, long ago, that "there would have been no difficulty in supporting the ministry in that church, if the church members had been united in each other, and in their pastor." It needed no parade of "proof of this" point. But why were they not? Why the opposition to Dr. Cheever? Why the alienation between the church members? Properly and strictly speaking, there is but one answer to this question, as "the public" very well knows. Ask any intelligent and disinterested observer—either pro-slavery or anti-slavery. The united testimony of nine-tenths of our citizens, to-day, would be that the question of slavery has divided the Church of the Puritans. So say the abolitionists. So say the anti-abolitionists. So say the abolition papers. So say the New York Observers and the *Heralds*. So say the daily papers of all descriptions.

One of the parties in the Church of the Puritans, wanted an out-spoken, aggressive opponent of slavery, in the pulpit. The other party, for various reasons, did not want such an one. The one party labors to sustain Dr. Cheever—the other does all it can to prevent his being sustained.

What is there, then, in this division in the church and society, that should prevent an honest and earnest abolitionist whether in England or America, from assisting in the support of Dr. Cheever and his friends, in the Church of the Puritans? To make this an objection, would be virtually saying that christian abolitionists, churches, and ministers, in America, ought not to be helped by their Trans-Atlantic brethren, under the only circumstances in which they need help.

But, "in May, 1859, the Society was declared free from debt." Well, what of it? If a church be out of debt, will its freedom from debt support its pastor? Or will it render it unwise or improper to make efforts for his support?

And how, and on what grounds was the church officially declared free from debt? Let *The Independent* answer—"A generous subscription having been made by the society at large"—and "some of the largest donors to that subscription" were alienated because their brethren were found making earnest efforts to support their pastor! How was this? Why should they have been offended, if they were really, in good faith, acting in the common cause? But what if they were not so? What if their obvious design was to get the

Church and Society out of debt, by the common efforts of the friends and the enemies of an anti-slavery gospel, and then turn off the faithful anti-slavery pastor, and take possession themselves, compelling the abolition members to sit under a different sort of preaching or quit the premises? What if a well founded apprehension of this—or, in the alternative, of a refusal to pay the "liberal subscription" to liquidate the debt, was the exciting cause of the original appeal to British Christians for aid? What if it should prove that, although the church was indeed officially declared free from debt, in May 1859, and so declared on the faith of subscriptions that have never yet been paid,—(not paid, because the conspiracy to oust Dr. Cheever did not succeed,)—what if it should prove that the Church is not out of debt as was supposed? We know not the precise facts, at this point. But our questions may serve to show the looseness of the logic upon which *The Independent's* argument proceeds. Especially do the well known facts show the ludicrous absurdity of urging, as an objection to the "British Aid Mission"—the consideration that "The Church of the Puritans, if united, is to-day, as well able to support itself as any church in the city of New York." Of course it would be, if they were all abolitionists, desirous of hearing the whole counsel of God against oppression, declared faithfully as Dr. Cheever declares it. Of course it would be, if those who have been, for years, laboring with all their might, to drive Dr. Cheever away, had been as heartily laboring for his support. In other words, the aid of British Christians would be unnecessary, if the church going community of wealthy and fashionable christians, in the elegant portion of the city of New York, were as willing and as desirous of hearing and of supporting such an anti-slavery gospel as is preached by Dr. Cheever, as they are to hear such an one as is preached in the "Broadway Tabernacle Church," and elsewhere.

And is such the logic by which *The Independent* expects to effect the double object—first, of convincing christian christians that their aid in supporting the Church of the Puritans is not needed—and second, of convincing them, that there is no essential distinction, or wide difference, between the anti-slavery sentiment of the pulpit of the Church of the Puritans, and that of the neighboring pulpits around it, Dr. Cheever being only an average representative of New York city ministers in general?

The Independent should know that the effort at proving too many things at once, sometimes results in proving neither of them. And it would do well to cherish but faint hopes of convincing christian abolitionists in Great Britain that there is no need of their aid in supporting in the city of New York, such a church as the Church of the Puritans, with such a pastor as Dr. Cheever. The very fact that his church is so divided, as *The Independent* represents it to be, will, of itself, certify them that their assistance is needed by the self-denying men and women who, amid such opposition, have proved faithful. The pretext that "an unnecessary and humiliating appeal for foreign aid" was the cause of the alienation and division, as it deceives nobody in New York, will be still less likely to deceive anybody in Glasgow or in London. Mutual assistance between the christians and the churches of the two nations, is nothing new. Nor was the idea of its being "humiliating" to seek and accept such aid, ever before thought of. The Free Church of Scotland never deemed it "humiliating" to ask and receive aid from this country—neither did the church in London that sent Dr. Waddington here recently, on a similar errand. It is, we confess, "humiliating" that an anti-slavery pastor, like Dr. Cheever, and that his friends in the Church of the Puritans, should have received the treatment they have received from the wealthy portion of that church and Society and especially from a Journal that, like *The Independent*, makes professions of anti-slavery, and of friendliness to the church and the pastor. But the fault of this does not lie upon the abolitionists in the Church of the Puritans, nor upon their pastor. Nor does it supply any argument against their appeal to British christians for aid.

But, *The Independent* proceeds:

2. Whatever may have been the original grounds of controversy and division in the Church of the Puritans, its present distractions have no connection whatever with the subject of slavery. The quarrel is entirely upon personal grounds and side issues. Money contributed to the church as such, would not further the cause of anti slavery.

This proposition is based on the former one, which we have demolished, and falls with it. The whole controversy in that Church, from the beginning to the present time, has been, and is, a controversy "connected with the subject of slavery"—a controversy whether the Church and its pastor shall continue the vigorous warfare against slavery that has been commenced. Let all the members be agreed on that point, and all the division will be healed. Let them all become thorough abolitionists, like Dr. Cheever and his earnest supporters, and *The Independent* will be unable to say that there are any divisions among them. There will then be no dispute nor complaint about that "secret" mission to England, nor about any thing else. On the other hand, let all the earnest abolitionists in that church consent to dismiss Dr. Cheever, and settle a pastor that shall not disturb the congregation nor the community with "the subject of slavery" any more than do the pastors of the neighboring churches, and the divisions will all be settled, of course.—Can even *The Independent* deny this? Or, would it be grieved with this latter result?

On whose authority does it say that "the quarrel is entirely on personal grounds." Very well does *The Independent* know that Dr. Cheever and every one of his supporters deny this.—By whom then, within the church and Society is it affirmed that "the quarrel is entirely on personal grounds?" Will the opponents of Dr. Cheever and his supporters avow this? Will they admit that it is a mere warfare of personalities, and not principles in which they are enlisted, and by which they are dividing the church, and rendering it impossible for the church to support itself without foreign aid? Will they thank *The Independent* for heralding that fact to the christians of both hemispheres? If not they must need deplore the unguarded paragraph by which that fact, if it be a fact, is betrayed.

GERRIT SMITH has published a Letter addressed by him to FREDERICK DOUGLAS, on the duty of the friends of Temperance and Freedom at the approaching Election, advocating an uncompromising adherence to their principles at the polls. Among its striking and characteristic paragraphs is the following, which we are happy to commend, as thoroughly orthodox.

"Christian, were Jesus again on the earth, would you vote to have him lead the forces for returning the poor slave to the disabilities and tortures from which he had escaped? The bare proposition is most abhorrent to you. How, then, can you consent to vote for Mr. Douglas, or Mr. Lincoln, or any other man who virtually tells you that he is willing to lead them? Has not party spirit blinded you? Nay, has it not corrupted you? What is too abominable for Christ to do is too abominable for any man to do; and thus would you yourself decide in every case where the spirit of Christ and not the spirit of party prompted the decision."

THE *HERALD* publishes Gerrit Smith's Letter to Frederick Douglas and accompanies it with a long editorial, which closes, very characteristically, as follows:

"The 'irrepressible conflict' is on. Mr. Gerrit Smith may be a good philosopher, but he is a poor politician. Having an abundance of this world's goods, he has never been able to comprehend the necessities which compel politicians to sink their principles for a season, in order to secure the spoils and power. This is the game of the Republicans, and the South and the North so understand it."

If the possession of wealth be the essential condition of political honesty, as the *Herald* supposes, we should think that the Editor of the *Herald* might afford to be honest, by this time. Very probably "he has never been able to comprehend" the "necessity" of honesty.

INTERFERENCE.—France had notified Turkey that the European Powers would interfere to stop the massacre of Christians in Syria.—*N. Y. Herald*.

The Herald can publish this item without a word of remonstrance or a note of exclamation against the impertinent interference. But what if the interference were for the relief of thrice the number of Christians in America, who have been subjected to lawless massacre, and even worse than massacre, for centuries?

Even American Christians can tell us that we, of the North, have no right to "interfere" for the protection of Christians, in our own country, because the Slave States, as they pretend, are as "foreign" to us, as "Russia and Turkey." Yet they can rejoice in the prospect of interference with Turkey, by the European Powers, in behalf of the Christians in Syria.

W. INDIA
currency to
slavery in
dustry"—a
island in re
fidently m
Within a fe
various. I
mony of E
twelve year
Baptist Mis
contains an
equally exp
many of the
ness of the

"THE DI
a few days
and, with
from the fie
24), at its o
column wid
headed, in v
—Highly i
toes from M
Alabama." Editorial he
South—Prep
column mo

"So far as
North will
President, a
into which
thrown, can
compared to
stocks will
kinds of pro
accumulated
ment. The
is a fact alr
meet the do
fanatics of t

It would be
tized the pul
the Herald c
dupes of his
him for play

We, gave
which cleare
January and
June eight v
brig Storm I
phine, Canter
May 19; har
Webster, B
Brightman, r
rette, master
Maraquita
charged. T
authorize co
these bound
per centage

The slave
ble at both
and not had
outset. Pres
no means of
siderable. I
without offic
do not know
has appeared
disappeared
thought, the
convict her,
mean time, b
—to be a ma
pendence. E
business, all
out of port-q
In this con
Is there no
Administration
We should
what efficien
alone in the S

W. INDIA EMANCIPATION.—While "The World" is giving currency to the pro-slavery pretence that "the abolition of slavery in the British West Indies was the abolition of industry"—authentic information from Jamaica—the very island in respect to which the complaint has been most confidently made, is giving the lie direct to the statement. Within a few days the testimony has been abundant and various. In our last paper, July 21, we presented the testimony of EDWARD BEANE UNDERHILL Esq., of London, for twelve years past Foreign Secretary of the English General Baptist Missionary Society. The N. Y. Times of July 20, contains another testimony from its correspondent W. G. S., equally explicit. There is indeed a scarcity of laborers on many of the plantations, but from other causes than the idleness of the negroes.

"THE DISSOLUTION HUMBUG" AGAIN.—The Herald that, a few days ago, could satirize the "humbug of dissolution" and, with apparent satisfaction, record its disappearance from the field of political agitation is, this morning, (July 24) at its old game of "humbug" again—filling column after column with "the Letter of HON. L. M. KEITT" &c., and headed, in variegated type with—"The Coming Revolution—Highly important from the South—Secession Manifestoes from Messrs. Keitt, of South Carolina, and Yancey of Alabama." Then, in another part of the sheet, comes an Editorial headed "The Irrepressible conflict begun" at the South—Preparations for disunion, followed by more than a column more of "humbug" like the following.

"So far as we can see, the Breckinridge movement at the North will avail nothing. Lincoln will be the Northern President, and Breckinridge the Southern. The confusion into which our commercial and monetary affairs will be thrown, cannot be described. Trade will receive a blow compared to which the storm of 1857 was a mere flurry; stocks will go down to within a fraction of nothing; all kinds of property will depreciate in value, and the fortunes accumulated by years of toil will be swept away in a moment. The crisis is imminent. The dissolution of the Union is a fact already determined upon. Let us be prepared to meet the doom which the trading politicians and crazy fanatics of the day have precipitated upon the republic."

It would be strange if, after having, like Barnum, advertised the public of his games of "humbug," the Editor of the Herald could successfully repeat them. The greatest dupes of his humbugs are his pro-slavery patrons, who pay him for playing his tricks upon themselves.

News of the Day.

SLAVE TRADE FROM NEW YORK.

We gave, not long since, a list of undoubted slavers which cleared from this port for Africa between the 1st of January and the 1st of May. To this we add for May and June eight vessels more, including the Kate, namely: the brig Storm King, Lockhart, master, May 2; schooner Josephine, Camer, master, May 17; bark Cora, Latham, master, May 19; bark Buckeye, Booth, master, May 21; brig D. Webster, Bruissan, master, May 29; bark F. Deming, Brightman, master, June 18; and schooner Maraquita, Burdette, master, June 19. Of these, the Cora, Josephine, and Maraquita have been stopped, and their cargoes discharged. The evidence of their intentions was sufficient to authorize confiscation. They have since gone to sea. If these bonds are ever paid, the sum will be a very small per centage on the profit on a cargo of negroes.

The slave-trade is a profitable business. It is profitable at both ends; for it pays those well who engage in it, and not badly those whose business it is to stop it at the outset. Precisely how much this latter class make, we have no means of knowing, but undoubtedly their gains are considerable. It is idle to suppose that these vessels get off without official connivance. All the methods adopted, we do not know; but sometimes, it is said, where no evidence has appeared against the vessels, a bag or two of gold has disappeared from her cabin; sometimes when, it was thought, the papers had been seized that would certainly convict her, they were found, when opened—having, in the mean time, been in possession of a sworn officer of the law—to be a mass of most innocent and uninteresting correspondence. Probably, where both parties understand their business, all public scandal is avoided, and the slaver slips off port quietly and unmolested.—N. Y. Tribune.

In this connection the Tribune adds.

Is there no remedy? There is none under a Democratic Administration.

We should like to know with what consistency or with what efficiency any administration pledged to let slavery alone in the States could interfere in the Slave Trade from

the States. The Federal laws against the Slave trade have always been a dead letter, and will continue to be, while Slavery itself is permitted to exist. If the united testimony of philosophy and history can prove any thing, they have, long ago, proved this. A national abolition of the Slave trade will never, in reality, be witnessed, in this country, without a national abolition of slavery.—Ed. Principia.

A ROCHESTER MAN HUNG BY A PRO-SLAVERY MOB IN KANSAS.

From The Rochester Evening Express.

The Leavenworth Herald of July 12 contains a letter dated at Paris, K. T., July 8, giving an account of the capture of Charles Doy (son of our former townsman, Dr. John Doy), by a band of Pro-Slavery ruffians on the charge of house-stealing—his escape, his subsequent capture, and his death! We quote:

"On Thursday last a party of nine men, 'armed and equipped as the law directs, but without legal process, arrested one Henry Woffle and son and Charles Doy (son of Dr. John Doy), on a charge of horse-stealing. They were tried, found guilty, and the sentence of death passed upon them. Doy and young Woffle succeeded in making their escape, the latter after being badly wounded. The sentence was executed upon the old man Woffle. He was deliberately shot, and his body left on the prairie. On Friday night the same company, enlarged by additional recruits, learning that Doy was concealed in a house owned by the old man Woffle, surrounded it about 10 o'clock, waited until daylight, procured a load of hay, fired it, and succeeded in dislodging him. He was tried, condemned, and immediately suffered death.

"Charles Doy migrated from Rochester to Kansas in 1854, three months after his father and D. R. Anthony of this city, went out with the pioneer party from Boston. Young Doy (he was then under age) passed through all the more terrible conflict attending the early settlement of Lawrence and Douglas County, and shared the most thrilling achievements of that little band of heroes who so successfully resisted and repelled the incursions of the Ruffian 'Chivalry.'

"The history of these times that tried men's souls is too familiar, and too fresh in the memories of all to require more than a passing allusion. During the guerilla war the Free-State men were often stripped of their horses and cattle, and household goods; and so frequent became these outrages, that at length they adopted a system of reprisal. The Doy, father and son, who had lost everything but the 'claims' on which they resided, of course shared these adventures, and hence the charge of horse stealing.

"The offense for which they were kidnapped and imprisoned at Platte City and St. Joseph, where for months they were subjected to the grossest indignities that their brutal captors could invent, was the attempted transportation of thirteen free colored persons, by the direction of the Town Board of Lawrence, from that city to the State of Iowa. The history of that cruel imprisonment, the trial and acquittal of Charles, the conviction and sentence of his father, and his subsequent rescue—so gallantly accomplished by a band of Free State men from Lawrence, under the leadership of Charles, is familiar to the readers of the Doy narrative.

"Dr. Doy returned to the Eastern States, where he has since been engaged in lecturing on the history of Kansas. Charles, unfortunately, as we see, remained to protect the family, and has at last fallen a victim to the insatiate fury of a brutal, bloody handed mob. The letter, which we quote, states that he 'suffered death'—in what manner is not described. As he was dislodged by setting fire to the house, it is probable that he was cut down or shot in attempting to escape. Like his father, he was a man of distinguished bravery, impatient of wrong, ready in his resources, and fearless in his measures of resistance and redress. While he defied danger like a hero, he endured suffering with the fortitude of a martyr. His private character was irreproachable. He was modest in his demeanor, strong in his attachments, generous, self-sacrificing in behalf of his principles and his friends. Death was the binding seal of the qualities of which his life was the witness. He lies with his brother, on a soil enriched and reeking with the sacrificial blood of American heroes. Their blood cries from the ground, and though retaliation be neither politic nor Christian the spirit of justice, if not of vengeance, will yet overtake their murderers."

THE WAR IN SYRIA.

[Alexandria letter (June 25,) in the London Times.]

The French mail steamer from Syria, which arrived here yesterday, has brought us full and recent particulars of the savage internecine warfare between the Druses and Maronite Christians of Mount Lebanon. We had previously heard that the dissensions between the two rival tribes had, at the latter end of last month, broken out into actual hostility; villages had been attacked and burnt down, and in many the silk crop of cocoons, the principal source of subsistence of the inhabitants, had been utterly destroyed, but the loss of life was not great. A few days later, more startling and alarming intelligence began to arrive. The advantage in the struggle, lay almost entirely on the side of the Druses, who were becoming more and more maddened into a state of savage fury with the sight of the blood that began to flow, and the Turks it was added; were more or less openly favoring their cause.

Yesterday the French mail steamer from Syria arrived with further intelligence of a recent date, which fully confirms the report previously received. The following private letter from Beyrout, dated the 20th inst., contains the more authentic particulars of the news that has spread at Alexandria:

During the past fortnight, affairs in the Lebanon have assumed a far more serious character. Hasbeyeh, and Rasbeyeh, two large and flourishing villages in the neighborhood of Mount Hermon, have been taken, sacked, and destroyed, by the Druses, in the presence of Turkish garrisons at both places. The Turks, it is said, made no attempt to protect the villages, but, on the contrary, gave active assistance to the enemy. Upon the places being captured, a large number of christian inhabitants, men, women, and children, took refuge in the Turkish Serai, or garrison. The officer in command of the Turkish troops, insisted upon the men giving up their arms. They did so, and the weapons were sent off to Damascus. He then entered into a parley with the leader of the Druses, which ended in the gates of the Serai being thrown open. The Druses entered the place, and a frightful and indiscriminate massacre of the unarmed and defenceless christians ensued, the Turkish troops passively looking on. A few of the christians contrived to escape and have taken refuge at Beyrout. The stories they relate of the cruelties inflicted by the Druses are most heart rending. In several other places, the Druses induced the christians to lay down their arms, on the assurance that they would not be molested, a promise immediately followed by their being murdered in their defenceless state, and their houses sacked and burnt. It is calculated that during the last three weeks more than sixty villages have been destroyed. The loss of life has been very great. The Pasha of Damascus has declared that he cannot guarantee the peace of that city for a week.

The Druses of Lebanon and of the Haman, assisted by Bedouins, have been besieging Zaleh, the largest and most flourishing town in Lebanon, containing a population of more than 10,000 inhabitants; but up to the present they have not been able to take it. The day before yesterday they were defeated by the christians with great loss—in fact, they have been driven from Zaleh three or four times, but it is feared that the place will not be able to hold out much longer, for want of ammunition. Should Zaleh fall, it will be the destruction of the christian interest in Lebanon. At Sidon great atrocities have been committed against the christians, and great numbers of them murdered. In short, the whole of Syria, from Aleppo to Gaza, is in a state of commotion and alarm. The Turkish authorities look on quietly, while the work of destruction goes forward, and when called upon by the European consuls to interfere and put a stop to the war, they make promises, but do nothing. They finally declare that they have not sufficient force. If so, it is high time that the European powers should interfere to rescue one of the finest and most flourishing provinces of the empire, from the misrule under which it has so long suffered, and from the utter destruction now impending over it. The only safe place at present remaining in Syria, is Beyrout. Two British vessels of war are lying off the town, a steamer of 11 guns, and a gun boat; also a Russian frigate, and three French ships—a frigate, a brig, and a steamer.

P. S.—June 21.—News arrived this morning, which I believe to be too true, that the Druses took Zaleh on the 18th inst, and that they are destroying it by fire. Both christians and Druses have suffered heavy loss. The women and children were sent out of the town a day or two before it was captured. The fall of Zaleh is a severe blow to the christians.

Correspondence of the Boston Traveller.

BEYROUT, June 21, 1860.

Zaleh has fallen! The last stronghold of the Christians has been taken, plundered and burnt, and its surviving inhabitants are flying like sheep from the wolver, that are now on their track. The Christian army has been annihilated, and the Christian power, which has for ages competed with the Druses, has been crushed. The fleet lay quietly at anchor in the harbor of Beyrout, while Zaleh was besieged, sacked and laid in ruins—and the Consuls-General, who have hitherto been so potent and mighty, have held daily and nightly consultations in vain. The desolation of the "goodly Lebanon" was decreed, and the besom of destruction has laid it waste.

The Consuls were in secret conclave all night, after the news of the sacking of Zaleh was received, to devise ways and means for the rescue of the surviving Christians of the country, from a general massacre. What they have done has not

transpired, but the butchery of the remainder of the one hundred and fifty thousand christians, is a sad thing to contemplate. We had hoped that the steamers of this week would have brought authority from the powers that be, to land marines for an armed interference, but in this we were disappointed. True, the Consuls were instructed to stop the war as soon as possible, but no power was placed at their disposal to conquer a peace. Moral suasion has not, in this barbarous land, the influence it enjoys in more civilized climes, and only an armed intervention can convince these blood-thirsty Druses, that the European powers are in earnest.

The absurdity of the present arrangement, is loudly proclaimed by the *coups de canon*, which even now shake my windows. The Queen, an English line-of-battle ship, has just arrived from Gibraltar, and is saluting the town. Twenty-one guns from H. B. M.'s ship of 120 guns, and 21 guns from the battery of the town, have a warlike sound, but they are mere courtesies and have no effect on the war. The Druses continue to butcher the Christians, to burn their towns, and kill their children, within hearing distance of these courteous salutes. The policy of England with reference to Turkey, is fraught with many evil consequences. Determined at all hazards to maintain the integrity of the Ottoman empire, she is unfavorable to the investigation proposed by Russia, into the condition of the christians in Turkey, and declare that the Hatti Hamayoun is not a dead letter. England doubtless fears the effect of an investigation, and dreads the partition of Turkey. And we all see with regret, that England has intimated to the Sublime Porte, that if the Sultan objects to the investigation by consuls, she will not insist upon it. Thus in the plainest manner advising that the consuls be not allowed to participate in the investigation. If the Commission is purely Turkish, all the evidence collected by the Consuls will be of no use. We await the issue with much anxiety. Missionary work is at a stand still in Mount Lebanon. It may be that all Franks will be driven from the land, for a time at least.

The United States Consul has repeatedly warned the Americans of their danger, and informed them that a residence in the mountains is no longer safe. Many have come down. To day the mission at Beyrout, passed a vote requesting the Rev. Mr. Calhoun of Alceip, the President of the College at that place, together with Mr. Bird of Deiril Kenir, to come to Beyrout at once.

The Christians, throughout this war, have been most cowardly, but the defence of Zaleh, the most warlike town in Lebanon, was conducted with much spirit. As an illustration of the manner in which the desperate forlorn hope of the Christians behaved in this last battle, in which about 7,000 Druses and Arabs were engaged in the siege, I will refer to one case only at present.

The Druses had gained the suburbs of the town, and had succeeded in setting fire to about a score of houses, when the Christians rallied, and drove them out upon the plain. The Druses were led by a most ferocious and blood thirsty chief, Kange el Amad. In the Christian army was a lad of fourteen years of age, who determined to die in defence of his home. He rushed into the ranks of the enemy, and, shooting the chief, fell, pierced with spears and bullets.

The chief was killed and the little hero shared his grave.

The destruction of Sidon has just been reported. 2,500 Christians are said to have been killed by Moslems and Druses. This intelligence requires confirmation, and is not generally credited.

MORE KIDNAPPING.

THREE NEGROES CARRIED SOUTH—SHAMEFUL OUTRAGE.

Three negroes living near Clifton, Iroquois County, Illinois, were kidnapped on the 2d. The local papers give the following account of the transaction. On Sunday the Kidnappers met at the house of John O'Neal, about three-fourths of a mile west of Clifton, procured a team, and placed sentinels along the road and in and about Ashkum. On the afternoon of that day, Geo. D. Smith went into the village and procured a room. He then went out and enticed the unsuspecting five negro men into this place, and called for, and was supplied with whiskey and cards. At a preconcerted signal, the whole company entered the house with knives and revolvers and attempted to take the negroes and fetter them. A general fight ensued, several of the negroes fighting desperately, and two made their escape. The three, Slater, who leaves a wife, and who is a free negro from Boston, John, from Maryland, and William, a little boy from Florida, were finally subdued and tied. They were immediately put into a lumber wagon in waiting, and run under the whip to Ashkum. The alarm having been given in and about Clifton, the citizens of the neighborhood assembled, and the down train from Chicago coming in a short time, they got aboard of the cars and went to Ashkum for the purpose of effecting a rescue. Arriving at that place the conductor ran into town without giving a signal, stopped but a moment, until the negroes could be rolled into the baggage car, and started his train without even attempting to make the usual signal. A large company was there armed, ready to prevent a rescue, and the Clifton men were compelled to jump off the train without having accomplished anything. The three negroes were taken South, and have undoubtedly, ere this time, been sold.

WENDELL PHILLIPS—ABRAHAM LINCOLN—AND THE N. Y. TRIBUNE.

Did Abraham Lincoln propose a Fugitive Slave bill for the Federal District?

Wendell Phillips charges that he did. The Tribune brands it as a "New Misrepresentation." What are facts? I. The original charge of Phillips is as follows:

From The Liberator.

Abraham Lincoln, the Slave-Hound of Illinois.

We gibbet a Northern hound to-day, side by side with the infamous Mason, of Virginia. Mason's slave bill is based on that clause of the United States Constitution which provides for the surrender of slaves escaping from one State into another State of the Union.

The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the District of Columbia is not a State within the meaning of the Constitution. (See *Hepburn vs. Ellzey*, 2 Cranch, 445.) The District of Columbia is not, therefore, included in the terms of the Fugitive Slave clause. Whoever tries to extend the dominion of that clause over the District of Columbia, exhibits only his own voluntary baseness, can have no pretence of constitutional obligation, out-Mason's Mason, and stamps himself a hound of special "alacrity."

This deed Abraham Lincoln, Republican candidate for President, has done! Here are the facts: Extract of a bill introduced by Hon. Abraham Lincoln, in the U. S. House of Representatives, Jan. 10, 1849. (See *Congressional Globe*, appendix, 2d session, 30th Congress, p. 212.)

"Section 5. That the municipal authorities of Washington and Georgetown, within their respective jurisdictional limits, are hereby empowered and required to provide active and efficient means to arrest and deliver up to their owners ALL FUGITIVE SLAVES escaping into said District."

Mr. Lincoln, in order to introduce this bill, requested the House to reconsider the vote, instructing the Committee on the District of Columbia to report a bill for abolishing the slave trade therein. To this request, Bingham, Dickinson, Giddings, Greeley, Horace Mann, Palfrey, Hudson, Wentworth, Wilmot, voted NAY; while Albert G. Brown (now the slave-code and slave-trading Senator), Butler (of Bully Brooks infamy), Howell Cobb, Goggin, Rhett, Iverson, LINCOLN, Toombs, voted YEA.

Mr. Lincoln, in urging his request, said he had submitted his proposition to various leading citizens of the District of Columbia, who gave it their unanimous approval.

No wonder Mr. Lincoln is unwilling to make any opposition to the Fugitive Slave bill! No wonder the Chicago Convention omitted that point in their resolutions! Their standard-bearer has a worse bill to answer for than even Mr. Mason.

The *New York Tribune* affirms that Mr. Lincoln stands on his record, and has no wish to alter any part of it. We wait to know of Republican journals where to draw that line which shall allow us all our indignation against Mason, and yet save the fame of their candidate.—*Liberator*. w. f.

II. How does the N. Y. Tribune meet this charge? Does it deny that Abraham Lincoln offered this proposition in the U. S. House of Representatives?

No. It does not. It copies the section 5, from the *Liberator*, verbatim and does not deny its correctness. But then, it proceeds to make an explanation of the object Mr. Lincoln had in view. We pass over some verbal or technical corrections of Mr. Phillips' statement, of no practical importance, and come to the gist of the matter, which is this:—

"Mr. Lincoln, let it be remembered, asked his colleague to withdraw his motion, simply that he might read the proposition which he intended to urge as an amendment, if the resolution prohibiting the slave-trade was reconsidered. Now this proposition is a bill of eight sections, of which 'W. P.' quotes one. The purpose of this bill was the abolition not merely of the slave-trade, but of Slavery itself in the District of Columbia, provided a majority of the people should cast their votes in favor of such a measure. The 5th section, so far from showing the general purport of the bill, is precisely that portion of it from which the character of the rest would never be guessed. It was merely intended to put the District on a footing with all the States in regard to 'fugitives from service,' when Slavery should no longer exist there, and nothing more. If Virginia may have the right to take her runaways in Boston, there is no good reason, *ceteris paribus*, why she should not in Washington. But this was the exceptional point of Mr. Lincoln's proposed amendment, and not its general purpose, for that was to sweep the system of Slavery out of the District, after a fixed time, by consent of the people, giving compensation to the master, and providing for the education and care of the emancipated."

This, then, if we understand it, amounts to an admission that Mr. Lincoln did propose a Fugitive slave bill for the District of Columbia. But the excuse is, that it was only a part of a bill he wished to propose, for abolishing slavery in that District.

III. How does Mr. Phillips answer the Tribune?—In the *Liberator* of July 13, after having discussed the verbal or

technical differences between their two statements, he says:

The *Tribune* thinks me unfair in not quoting the whole bill. I quoted all that concerned my accusation, and certainly did not omit the rest from any wish to hurt Mr. Lincoln. The Bill itself is no credit to any man, being one of the poorest and most confused specimens of pro-slavery compromise. It provides, substantially, 1st, that no slave shall be carried out of the District, and no slave shall be brought in, except by United States officials coming from the South, who are about all the persons that wish to hold slaves in the District. Such persons are to be allowed to hold them there forever. 2d. All children born after 1850, were to be free some time or other; it does not say when. 3d. Slaves in the District were to remain such until their holders wished to sell them, at which time the United States Government were bound to buy them. 4th. All this was to be law, if the people of the district voted for it!!! 5th. The district was to be a slaveholding ground forever!

Marvellous anti-slavery! a proposition to abolish robbery if the robbers request it!! And this in 1849 of the Christian era; and relates to a territory, from which the Constitution excludes all slavery; and of which Congress has the exclusive control. Considering that Republicanism professes to exclude slavery from all our Territories, as its special work, I should style Lincoln's bill, 'A Bill of the Republican President to recognize, extend and perpetuate slavery in the United States.' If any of Mr. Lincoln's friends consider this Bill a feather in his cap, let it, by all means, be paraded. It strikes me as one of those blunders which a man's well-wishers desire to hush up among his friends.

Mr. Phillips then repeats his original charge, as copied from The Tribune, and adds;

Observe his proposition: It provides no safeguards,—no jury trial; takes no care to prevent free men being carried off as slaves;—in these respects, it is worse than even Mason's Bill. The municipal authorities are to 'provide active and effective means'—that is all.

This was my charge. I now add that the *New York Tribune* confesses that its Presidential candidate, Mr. LINCOLN, did just this deed.

If, as the *Tribune* says 'there is no good reason' why the Fugitive Slave clause, constitutionally valid in Boston, should not be extended to Washington, where the Constitution does not now carry it, then the same may be said of Canada and Liverpool. Once grant that this infamous pro-slavery compromise, which every decent man abhors, may properly be extended one inch, and slaveholders and their New York apologists, will show excellent and weighty reasons for extending it to Canada and Liverpool. We might have supposed that the Republican party, which vindicates its existence solely on the ground of its purpose to resist the extension of slavery, and of keeping it within strict constitutional limits, would see many a 'good reason' against extending the area of this pro-slavery and diabolical covenant. To an abolitionist, saving even five miles square, and specially the residence of the Government, sacred to freedom, seems something, amid this universal wreck. According to the *Tribune*, such small matters are unworthy of consideration!

Hear, therefore, all ye Republican journals and voters! the *New York Tribune* sees 'no good reason' why we may not now doom fresh Territory to slave-hunting—why the Fugitive Slave clause should not be extended further than the Constitution carries it: and it distinctly admits that its Presidential candidate, Mr. Abraham Lincoln, has expressed his wish and intention so to extend it, for which wish and intention the *Tribune* has no word of blame.

In these circumstances, if the *Tribune* really sees 'no good reason' why the area of slave-hunting should not be extended further than the Constitution requires—then, instead of one Slave-Hound, I have discovered two, among Republican leaders—Mr. Lincoln, of Illinois, and the *New York Tribune*; and on their collars I shall engrave in black capitals, 'Volunteers.' I might make up a human's leash, three hounds: putting Lincoln in the center, Mason of Virginia on one side, and the *Tribune* on the other. But this would not balance; since Mason, poor narrow-souled sinner, only demands what he deems his constitutional rights, while the two 'Volunteers,' more daring knaves, propose to extend the area of slave-hunting, and doom to that base fate soil which the Constitution consecrates to liberty.

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

The *Tribune's* response to this, throws no additional light on the main question, and adds nothing to the argument.

We think Mr. Phillips has altogether the winning side of the controversy. In nothing essential to the main question, has the *Tribune* furnished any correction to his statements. The *Tribune* would have shown its discretion by silence.

EUROPE.

The steamship *Africa*, from Liverpool, arrived at this port with London papers of the 7th and telegraphic advices via Londonderry, of the 8th inst. Telegrams from Sicily say that Gen. Garibaldi was marching on Messina. The General was about to receive large supplies, both of men and stores; about 2,000 men were to sail for Sicily from Genoa, where great numbers of volunteers are assembled; and a French house is said to have taken a contract for some thousand of revolvers, rifles and muskets, for Garibaldi's service. Naples, at latest dates, was tranquil, and the proclamation of martial law had been rescinded. The Neapolitan Assembly, it is stated, is convoked for the 10th of September. The Constitution of 1848 has been proclaimed anew, and its restoration has been accompanied by the

re-establishment of these com- in the min- ters—and seem to ju- ing the Sa- King of Na- tween Nap- kingdom 4- The proce- In both d- discussed for the Ga- erton, on t- in the Hou- to a quest- by the the arrang- Juan dispu- we presume appear from funeral of f- of the fete- commemor- state that t- greatest at- whole of S- greatest co-

The Jura- Queenstown-

The proce- The state-

again been- Lord Bro-

thought the- failure, and- tyrant of N-

The Marq- Gen. Gariba-

in the sense- he had said,

man, in viol- of supreme p-

country, he- which it was-

Lord Brou- baldi has as-

nations. Al- is to be enfo-

on any nation- law of nation-

[This was- Lord Brougl-

tion to the op- in America.—

Lord Wod- Secretary in-

denial of any- these excesses-

that he had t- [Hear, hear,

Gen. Gariba- able to preve-

disapproved. highest credi-

and displayed- outrages had-

tion, outrages- troops, which-

and which we- pressed peopl-

The subject- In the Hou-

ties of a reso- Lords, in re-

duties, an inn- that it is incur-

restoration of- Mr. Gladsto-

an amended r- The Prince-

July. [He ha-

The steam- inst., passed C-

over to Garib- in Liverpool f-

that France ha- of 1812 to the-

British Parliam- ernment not t-

mont. Lord J- could not depa-

right to choos- European Con-

stated that Eng- dia, while Au-

agreed to absto- tion in Syria, w-

re-establishment of the Press laws enacted in 1848 and 1849. These concessions of the King have created no confidence in the minds of the people. It is asserted in various quarters—and the language of the *Opinione* of Turin would seem to justify the assertion—that France is urgently pressing the Sardinian Cabinet to listen to the overtures of the King of Naples and consent to the conclusion of an alliance between Naples and Piedmont. The Government of the latter kingdom does not conceal its aversion to the proposition. The proceedings of the British Parliament are interesting. In both Houses, the revolution in Southern Italy had been discussed, and the speakers evinced the warmest sympathy for the Garibaldi movement. The resolutions of Lord Palmerston, on the Privilege question, had been carried *seriatim* in the House of Commons. Lord John Russell, in answer to a question, had stated that Gen. Harney had been recalled by the United States Government for not carrying out the arrangements of Gen. Scott for the solution of the San Juan dispute. As the announcement was made officially, we presume it is correct. Two unusually interesting letters appear from our Paris Correspondent; one describing the funeral of Prince Jerome, and the other giving an account of the *fete champetre*, with which our countrymen in Paris commemorated the national holiday. Letters from Beyrout state that the civil war in Syria is spreading, and that the greatest atrocities are committed against Christians. The whole of Syria, from Aleppo to Gaza, was in a state of the greatest commotion.—*N. Y. Times*, 21 July.

The *Jura* arrived at N. York, left Liverpool the 10th and Queenstown the 11th.

The proceedings in Parliament possess but little interest. The state of Italy and the conduct of Gen. Garibaldi had again been debated in the House of Lords.

Lord Brougham, in the course of his remarks, said he thought the Constitution granted to Naples would be a great failure, and he hoped it would fail to save the detestable tyrant of Naples.

The Marquis of Normanby said he had never alleged that Gen. Garibaldi was personally chargeable for these excesses in the sense belonging to those who inflicted them. What he had said, and what he now repeated, was that when a man, in violation of the law of nations, assumed possession of supreme power in a country like Naples, or any other country, he did render himself responsible for the outrages which it was acknowledged had been committed in Sicily.

Lord Brougham—My noble friend says that Gen. Garibaldi has assumed his position in violation of the law of nations. All I can say in reply is that if the law of nations is to be enforced to effect perpetual subjugation and misery on any nation, the sooner we hear as little as possible of the law of nations the better. [Hear, hear.]

[This was a noble and truly statesmanlike utterance of Lord Brougham, and is equally appropriate in its application to the oppressions and barbarities of the Slave Power in America.—*Principia*.]

Lord Wodehouse said that the statement of the Foreign Secretary in the other House went much further than a denial of any proof that Gen. Garibaldi had connived at these excesses. On the contrary, the last accounts showed that he had taken very severe measures to prevent them. [Hear, hear.] When a man was placed in the position of Gen. Garibaldi it was not surprising that he should not be able to prevent the commission of everything of which he disapproved. [Hear, hear.] He certainly deserved the highest credit for the generosity and moderation which he had displayed. It must not be forgotten, too, that, if some outrages had been committed in the excitement of a revolution, outrages had been previously committed by the Royal troops, which were perfectly well known to all the world, and which were unsurpassed by anything of which the oppressed people of Sicily had been guilty. [Hear.]

The subject then dropped. In the House of Commons, Lord Fernoy had given notice of a resolution declaring the action of the House of Lords, in rejecting the bill for the repeal of the paper duties, an innovation upon the rights of the Commons, and that it is incumbent on the House to adopt measures for the restoration of its rights and privileges.

Mr. Gladstone had also stated his intention to introduce an amended resolution in reference to the paper duties.

The Prince of Wales embarked for Canada on the 10th of July. [He has now arrived at St. John's.]

The steamer *Canada*, with European dates of the 15th inst., passed Cape Race on Monday evening. A dispatch from Cagliari states that a Neapolitan steamer had gone over to Garibaldi. Several steamers had been purchased in Liverpool for Garibaldi, and had started. It is reported that France had assented to Naples offering the Constitution of 1812 to the Sicilians, but England hesitated. In the British Parliament, Sir Robert Peel had called on the Government not to assent to the annexation of Sicily to Piedmont. Lord John Russell replied that the Government could not depart from the principle that the people had the right to choose their own rulers. With reference to the European Conference relative to Savoy, Lord John Russell stated that England had accepted the proposition of Prussia, while Austria hesitates. England and France had agreed to abstain from present interference in the insurrection in Syria, which still continued, as Fud Pasha had gone

there armed with full powers to act. In case Turkey proves incapable to quell the insurrection, then these two Governments will interpose to stop the massacres. Great alarm was felt at Beyrout. The Druses had killed over 2,000 unarmed men in the destruction of one village. Advices from Hong Kong, of May 23, state that the British forces had left for Peiho, and that a collision is inevitable. Breadstuffs quiet, and sales unimportant. Consols 93½@94¼.

RUSSIAN EMANCIPATION—ITS EFFECTS

[THE TRIBUNE translates from the correspondence of *Le Nord*.]

“ST. PETERSBURG, June 27.

“Since the great problem of the emancipation of the Serfs has been definitely resolved upon, the noble cause of national civilization, so intimately connected with emancipation and its indispensable complement, has been making notable progress, day by day.

“Our papers are filled with news, which comes to them from all parts of the country, of the establishment of free schools and of Sunday-schools. Every day sees new schools opened, of a character to attract and to educate the lower classes of the population. They are already very numerous and scattered over the whole extent of the country, not to speak of the two capitals where they are no longer a new thing, we see them starting up, in remote hamlets and villages under the patronage of the landholders, or of some other public spirited persons.

“We need not say that these free schools, established in the interest of the people, and multiplied on the eve of their emancipation, are called to exercise an influence on the future of the working classes, which must be most salutary. By correcting the deeply-rooted prejudices and by dissipating the ignorance of the Russian people, these schools will render them worthy of the independence which is soon to be conferred upon them, in giving them those ideas of responsibility and of labor, which are the first and the essential conditions of liberty.

“The preparation for the Emancipation of the Serfs may henceforth be considered as complete. The Commissions are at present engaged upon the actual drafting of the laws which are to embody the results at which they have arrived through so much labor and deliberation. The Imperial manifesto decreeing the abolition of Slavery will appear, as I have said before, during the autumn, after the field labor is finished, at the end of October or the beginning of November. The Government has adopted the necessary financial measures in order to act as a mediator in the settlement of relations between the landholders and the emancipated Serfs.

“The Commission intrusted with the elaboration of a new system of regulating the sale of strong liquors, intended to replace the present sale of monopolies, which, in any event, will soon be abolished, has finished its work and it is now before the Counsel of the Empire. It is to be hoped that the monopoly system will be entirely abolished, and that a tax will be laid on the distilleries instead, as is the custom in Europe.

“In the meantime, thanks to the Temperance Societies, the brandy monopoly is abolishing itself before the term fixed by Government, and we are continually hearing of the stoppage of such and such a monopoly in the different provinces of the Empire.”

Family Miscellany.

AT SEA.

BY SAMUEL LONGFELLOW.

The night was made for cooling shade,
For silence, and for sleep;
And when I was a child, I laid
My hands upon my breast and prayed
And sank to slumbers deep.
Childlike as then, I lie to-night
And watch my lonely cabin light.

Each movement of the swaying lamp
Shows how the vessel reels,
And o'er her deck the billows tramp,
And all her timbers strain and cramp,
With every shock she feels;
It starts and shudders, while it burns,
And in its hinged socket turns;

Now swinging slow, and slanting low,
It almost level lies,
And yet I know, while to and fro
I watch the seeming pendule go,
With restless fall and rise,
The steady shaft is still upright,
Poising its little globe of light.

O, hand of God! O, lamp of peace!
O, promise of my soul!
Though weak and tossed, and ill at ease,
Amid the roar of smiting seas
The ship's convulsive roll
I own, with love and tender awe,
Yon perfect type of faith and law!

A heavenly trust my spirit calms!
My soul is filled with light!
The ocean sings his solemn psalms;
The wild winds chant; I cross my palms;
Happy as if to-night
Under the cottage roof again
I heard the soothing summer rain.

For the Principia.

THE IDEAL AND THE REAL OF LIFE.

A SCHOOL GIRL'S EXPERIENCE.

Concluded.

“But now, we thought when we were all settled, we should have a little time for literary leisure. I was going to study Latin and Greek. Fred loved Latin; he said it was such a strong, grand language, and was such a discipline to the mind! And Greek was so beautiful! I was going to teach him French and German. I would set apart a certain number of hours daily, which should be sacred to intellectual seclusion. In the evenings we were going to pursue a course of reading together. O, yes! when things became systemized we should accomplish a great deal!

Fred said I must have a servant girl. I thought I could do without, but when I came to reflect that we must give up the irregular mode of life we had hitherto pursued, get up three regular meals daily, at fixed hours, and institute regular washing days and ironing days, and sweeping days and baking days, my heart began to fail me, and I consented. Accordingly, Fred drove over to the city, one day, and brought me an Irish girl.

Well, of course, I supposed if I had a girl, all I should have to do would be to show her the kitchen, tell her what I would have for dinner, shut myself up in my room, and come down, at the proper hour, to find all right, just as I did at home. Therefore, I showed her around, told her where everything was kept, mixed up the cakes for breakfast, to teach her my way, and left her in charge. The next morning, Fred and I took an early morning walk, saw the sun rise, heard the birds sing, gathered flowers, and thought how nice it was to have such a sweet little season of communion with Nature, instead of devoting our energies to procure wherewith to satisfy physical necessities. We planned our study hours, and our course of reading; we looked at our newly-planted rose bushes; and then resorted to our sanctum, to turn over Latin and French books. By and by we began to wonder why Bridget didn't call us to breakfast, and with some trembling, I started on a voyage of discovery, to the kitchen regions. To my dismay, the room was filled with smoke, and Bridget was vigorously digging away, with a knife, at the burning cakes on the stove.

“Sure they wont come up for me!” greeted my ears, in doleful tones.

“O, Bridget, you didn't grease your griddle! Here, take it up, and—well, let me see!—carry it out of doors, *do*, and stop all this smoke!” When I had done all I could towards restoring tranquility, I proceeded to investigate further, and found that she had prepared the chocolate by frying it in butter, and seasoning it with salt and pepper! I was obliged to invite Fred to a breakfast of bread and butter and cold meat, to which (I record it as an example to husbands) he submitted with the best grace in the world, at the same time comforting me by saying that the laugh he had enjoyed was worth half a dozen breakfasts!

And now farewell to Virgil and all the classics! Farewell, a long farewell to Hume and Gibbon, to Plato and Newton, to Coleridge and Shelley! For the present I must devote myself to the task of drilling Bridget in those arts and sciences which pertain to the physical wants of humanity.

O, those days in the kitchen with Bridget! My mind was exercised as it never had been, in any previous undertaking. I believe if one of those old philosophers who closeted himself up, and spent his life and strength in abstruse metaphysical speculations, had only tried it, it would have done him good, and set his great, massive brain working as nothing else in the universe ever did. Those hermits, too, who used to live in caves or on the top of columns to “crucify the flesh,” might have crucified it to some purpose, if they had only known what I learned, then!

Picture me rolling out pie-crust, and trying to study about “genitives,” and “datives,” and “accusatives,” and Fred

coming to me with a button off his coat, and Bridget upsetting the churn full of cream all over the newly scrubbed floor! Think of my sitting with my folio on one corner of the pine table, writing an article for the "Star" on "The Poetic Element in the character of Joan of Arc," and pausing at intervals to tell Bridget how much yeast to put in, and how warm to have the water for the bread; and laying aside my pen to give it a professional turn or two; or stopping, just as I was getting inspired, to administer a good, vigorous, orthodox kneading! Isn't that a discipline? I told Fred it was worth a score of Latin grammars.

What I most disliked about this, was the steady, persistent manner in which matter would insist upon claiming precedence of spirit. It was really astonishing to see how much time and thought and mental energy was required in the eating branch of human affairs. Indeed it did seem as if getting ready to eat, and eating, and cleaning up after eating, and wearing clothes and getting them dirty, and preparing them to wear again, was the great business of life. There that little woman across the street, with three small children, works unceasingly from morning till night, to bring about the meals, and keep her family in order; and half the women in the village pursue the same course, and never think of anything different! It is sad that these maternal cares should wear out a woman's spirit, exhaust all the freshness and buoyancy of her nature, and perhaps her amiability. It is humiliating that she cannot meet her husband with a sunny smile because the bread is sour or the steak overdone, or that her mind should revert to the condition of her larder the first thing, on meeting an old friend. I determined from the first that my spirit should be too lofty to bow so low to matter; that burnt cake, and heavy bread, and dirty pots and kettles should never triumph over me! Ah, but it was harder to keep up to that resolution than you would have any idea of, till you'd tried it!

My mind began to be very much exercised on the social question. I could not but think how much easier and pleasanter it would be to pitch a tent in some romantic spot, and live on roots and berries, and take care of sheep, like the ancients. One day I commenced writing an article on the relative merits of barbarism and civilization—in which the excellences of the former were enlarged upon, much to the disparagement of the latter—but in the midst of it the preserves boiled over, and Bridget got a dreadful crock on one of Fred's fine shirt bosoms! So the essay remains unfinished, in the desk.

Such is real life. Quite different from the ideal, but far more potent in developing every faculty of the mind and virtue of the heart. From experience, I have come to the conclusion that *this life is intended for discipline*, and that matter is one of the great agents in the administration thereof. So Fred and I take it. We live simply, find some time, though not uninterrupted, for reading and study, and are very happy. Come and see us, won't you? L.

BEST METHOD FOR MAKING APPLE DUMPLINGS.—On baking days, take a bit of the bread dough, according to the size of the family, and work in a little more butter or other shortening, than for biscuit. Make out the dumplings, put them on a plate to rise the same as biscuits, and when light set the plate with the dumplings upon it in the steamer, and steam half an hour, then set them in the oven for a few minutes for the moisture to dry from the surface, and they are ready for the table. Serve with whatever sauce you please.

Did house-keepers and cooks more generally understand and appreciate the advantages of steam in cooking, our stoves would be much better supplied with conveniences for that purpose. Almost anything can be cooked by steam much quicker, and with a less amount of fuel than in any other way. Potatoes, and most other vegetables, to say nothing of puddings, custards, &c., are much better if steamed till nearly done, and then placed in the oven, for a short time, only. In warm weather, particularly, when a great fire would be necessary to heat the oven, (as well as the house,) a very little would heat a steamer and be much more comfortable as well as economical. Apple dumplings are much better steamed than cooked in any other way. If baked, they are apt to be dry and hard,—if boiled in water they are quite as likely to become water soaked and clammy. Steaming avoids both three extremes.

A SCENE IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

What a pageant of splendor and of grandeur was here presented! The floor of the house was packed with the wives, and daughters, and sisters of the peers, in full dress, leaving only a narrow space in the center, which was occupied by peers and bishops in their brilliant scarlet robes. The entire gallery which surrounds the house was filled with a row of elegantly dressed ladies, only broken by a line of reporters occupying seats directly opposite the throne. Behind the reporters, the benches, one rising above another, were filled with ladies. Presently the trumpets sound—the signal that the Queen is approaching. She leaves the palace in her magnificent state carriage, drawn by eight cream colored horses, attended by her ministers and household officers, in carriages but little less sumptuous than her own, escorted by the Life Guards, all mounted on noble black horses—the whole cortege forming a most magnificent spectacle. In alighting from the carriage, her Majesty's foot presses an electric wire, which fires a cannon in the park.

The usher of the golden rod gives a signal; and suddenly every lady in the house throws off her opera cloak, or shawl, or mantle, and a more beautiful revelation can hardly be imagined, surely not described.

MODERATE DRINKING.—Let no man say, when he thinks of the drunkard, broken in health, and spoiled in intellect, "I can never so fall." He once thought as little of falling in earlier years. The promise of his youth was as bright as yours, and even after he began his downward course, he was as unsuspicious as the firmest around him, and would repel, as indignantly, the admonition to beware of intemperance. The danger of the vice lies in its almost imperceptible approach. Few who perish by it, have, by its first excess.—Youth does not suspect drunkenness in the sparkling beverage, which quickens all susceptibilities of joy. The invalid does not see it in the cordial which gives new tone to his debilitated organs. The man of thought and genius detects no palsy poison in the draught which seems a spring of inspiration to intellect and imagination. The lover of social pleasure little dreams that the glass which animates conversation, will sink him too low for the intercourse in which he now delights. Intemperance comes with noiseless steps and binds the first cords too light to be felt. This truth of mournful experience should be treasured by all, and should influence the arrangements and habits of social and domestic life in every class of community.—*Dr. Channing.*

There lies in the depth of every heart that dream of our youth, and the chastened wish of manhood which neither cares nor honors can ever extinguish, the hope of one day resting from the pursuits which absorb us, of interposing between old age and the tomb, some tranquil interval of reflection, when, with feelings not subdued, but softened, with passions not exhausted, but mellow, we may look calmly on the past without regret, and on the future without apprehensions. But in the tumult of the world, this vision forever recedes as we approach it, the passions which have agitated our life, disturb our latest hours, and we go down to the tomb, like the sun into the ocean, with a gentle and gradual withdrawing of life to the source which gave it, but sullen in its fiery glow long after it has lost its power and splendor.

RICHES AND LIBERALITY.—No man fears riches. Yet it is a fact, generally, that a man's liberality does not increase in proportion as he grows rich. It is exactly the reverse. He extends his desires; luxuries become necessities. He must move in another sphere, keep more servants, and take a larger house. Let any one compare the sums given in charity by those of moderate income with the sums given by the wealthy. Here, in England, the rich give their hundreds, the poor their thousands.—[English paper.]

STRAWBERRY BEDS, as soon as the fruit is off, should receive attention. Keep down the weeds and cut off the runners, unless they are required to form new beds. If the system of "culture in altered strips" is adopted, the runners should be thinned out, when too thick and kept free from weeds, and allowed to get well rooted before the old plants are spaded under, say about the middle of August.

"OLD PATCH."

There was a poor boy who came to school with a large patch on his knee. One of his school-fellows, who was a "great tease," began to nick-name him "Patch," and sometimes "Old Patch." "Why don't you fight him? Give it to him," cried the boys. "I wouldn't be called names so; I'd give it to him." "Pooh!" answered the boy with the patch, "you don't suppose I'm ashamed of my patch, do you? For my part, I am thankful for a good mother to keep me out of the rags. I honor my patch for her sake." There was "no getting the better of Patch," the boys said; "not a bit of false shame about him." And how the boys honored him for it!—*Child's paper.*

GOD IN LITTLE THINGS.—Many think that God takes no thought for anything less than a star or a mountain, and is unmindful of the little things of life; but when I go abroad, the first thing which I see is the grass beneath my feet, and nestling in that, flowers smaller yet, and lower still, the mosses with their inconspicuous blossoms, which, beneath the microscope, glow with beauty. And if God so cares for "the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven," shall he not much more care for the minutest things of your life, "O ye of little faith!"—[Beecher.]

TANNING SKINS WITH THE FUR ON.—Nail the fresh skin tightly and smoothly against a door, keeping the skin side out. Next proceed with a broad bladed blunt knife to scrape away all loose pieces of flesh and fat; then rub in much chalk, and be not sparing of labor; when the chalk begins to powder and fall off, take the skin down, fill it with finely-ground alum, wrap it closely together, and keep it in a dry place for two or three days; at the end of that time unfold it, shake out the alum, and the work is over.—*Scientific American.*

"SIR," said a boy, going up to the counter of a dram-seller, "I want to ask you never to sell my father another glass of grog. He's a kind father as ever was when he's sober, but rum tigers him."

"What right have I to refuse him, more than any other man?" asked the rum-seller.

"You may tell him Bob begged you, for the sake of his family, and for his own sake, not to," said the boy. "If you give it to him, he'll kill my mother, and you'll be the murderer." Home truth, that.—*Id.*

BLOWING OUT A CANDLE.—There is one small fact in domestic economy which is not generally known, but which is useful, as saving time, trouble, and temper. If the candle be blown out holding it above you, the wick will not smoulder down, and may therefore be easily lighted again, but if blown out downward, the contrary is the case.

A warm, blundering man does more for the world than a frigid, wise one. A man who gets into the habit of inquiring about properties, and expediences, and occasions, often spends his life without doing anything to the purpose.—*Cecil.*

He in whom there is much to be enveloped, will be later in acquiring true perceptions of himself and of the world. There are few who at once have Thought and the capacity of Action; Thought expands, but lames: Action animates, but narrows.—*Gathe.*

We celebrate nobler obsequies to those we love by drying the tears of others, than by shedding our own; and the fairest funeral wreath we can hang on their tomb is a fruit-offering of good deeds.—*Jean Paul.*

Women love to find in men a difficult combination—a gentleness which will invariably yield, with a force which will invariably protect.

THE ANALYST.

A weekly Family Paper, devoted to Temperance, Progress, and Social Improvement, published by M. H. ALLARDT, 197 Superior Street, Cleveland, O.—Send for Specimens.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia*:
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 3 Vols. \$1 00
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol. \$1 00
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol. \$0 75

TERMS CASH.

D. P. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 199 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.

VOL. I.

Published by
Harpers' Bu

TERMS:
Direct bu

as above.

Our object,
Christian refo
kindred crime
ties, business
the Church, th
God, restoring
type of heav
our expedienc
less; our pan
Editor

THE

The follo
appearance
this, we ha
it in our c
But the pre
than any pr
very, slave
in the polit
of the Terr
priety of th
Puritans—
didates—al
er slaves ar
indeed thur
any such th
them as pro
anywhere in
property in
fail to rebu
of holding t
as property
claim of pro
the "questi
intelligent j

Slaves

Mr. Wigf
recent spee
the South
other prop
erty shall
of property.
Mr. Wigf
speaking in
"simple" de
merest trile
disgust and
were unwill
Mr. Wigf
dwelling up
would be th
establish thi
country, the
sire. In fac
ed. All the
all the cont
of slavery, t
empty and u
nease and t
hogs," as M
clared that
treated by t
ion—if this
upon which
of the Unite